

**PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION
MINUTES**

The Putnam County Plan Commission met for its regular monthly meeting on May 11, 2022, at 6:30 p.m. in the Putnam County Courthouse, 1 West Washington Street, 1st Floor, Greencastle, IN 46135. Wendell Underwood called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. A roll call was taken to determine a quorum. The following members were present: Wendell Underwood, Jenna Nees, Kevin Scobee, Ken Heeke, and Rick Woodall. Randy Bee, David Penturf, Eric Hayman, and Jay Alcorn was not present. Also, present was Jim Ensley, County Attorney; and Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director. Audience present see attached sign in sheet.

REVIEW OF MINUTES

Mr. Underwood asked if the board had any corrections, additions, or other changes to the April 13, 2022, meeting minutes. There being no changes, corrections, or additions, Mr. Underwood asked for a motion.

Kevin Scobee made a motion to approve the April 13, 2022, minutes as presented.

Ken Heeke seconded the motion.

The April 13, 2022, minutes were approved as submitted with all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS:

DISCUSSION ONLY – Agricultural districts of other counties as requested from discussion about changing acreage in A1 from five acres and the road frontage from 350 feet.

Lisa Zeiner presented a draft ordinance revision for A1 and A2 zoning districts for the board to review prior to publishing for a public meeting. Mrs. Zeiner stated that on page two under item ‘D’ is where the changes start. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the current acreage in A1 is five acres, so that was left as five acres for all permitted uses. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the permitted uses are all farm related uses, not dwelling uses.

Rick Woodall asked what page of the packet the ordinance was.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the ordinance is after the April minutes, right behind the blue paper that states Agricultural Zoning Ordinance.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that the five acres was kept at five acres because that would allow for a mini farm of cows, crop, etc. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the biggest change is the parcel size for any accessory use and structure shall be two acres or the minimum acreage estimated by the County Health Department for a primary and backup septic system site, whichever is less. Mrs. Zeiner explained however, that in no case shall the parcel size be less than one acre. Mrs. Zeiner stated that minor subdivisions was added under accessory uses. Mrs. Zeiner explained that setbacks also changed for residential structures. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the A2 Zoning District the uses were the same, however the acreage changed. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the current acreage in A2 is three acres, and that would remain the same for permitted uses. Mrs. Zeiner stated that for permitted accessory uses the acreage would change to one acre, or the minimum acreage estimated by the County Health Department for a primary and backup septic system site, provided that the proposed parcel size is not less than one acre. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the setbacks would also change based on the lot size. Mrs. Zeiner stated that with the proposed changes the homestead exemption would be removed as a possible way to subdivide a property. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the homestead exemption allowed for three acres, and since the parcel size was being decreased for a dwelling a homestead exemption would not be necessary.

Jenna Nees asked if there had been any change to the road frontage.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that road frontage would be changed to two hundred feet for both A1 and A2 districts. Mrs. Zeiner explained that an acre of ground was roughly two hundred and eight (208) square feet, so changing the road frontage to two hundred feet made the most sense.

Mr. Woodall asked who came up with all the changes.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the draft was taken from the comments of previous meetings when the board discussed possibly changing the ordinance.

Mr. Underwood asked if the information from other counties was still available.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that information was attached to the April meeting minutes. Mrs. Zeiner explained that a compromise was used between the other counties and what the board had been discussing.

Mr. Woodall asked how the counties chosen for the study was determined.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that she looked at the counties that were touching Putnam and the counties that were the same size of as Putnam County.

Greg Williams, with ASA Land Surveying, stated that the two hundred feet would still be more restrictive than all the surrounding counties.

Mr. Underwood asked where the two hundred feet came from.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was a compromise with the current zoning and what the other counties had. Mrs. Zeiner explained that a one-acre square was two hundred eight feet by two hundred eight feet. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the fifty-foot stripe leading back to a parcel was not included in the changes because minor plat was included that would allow for up to a three-lot split from the parent parcel, which would then be covered under the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

Mr. Williams asked if the two hundred feet was only if it boarded a road if it was offset somewhat how would that work.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that a minor plat or a conservation subdivision would be required in those instances.

Mr. Williams stated that anything that does not front on a road, a minor plat would be required.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was correct.

Mr. Woodall asked if those lots would be "flagpole" lots.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that they would have a private road that would be done per county standards and could be turned over to the county for maintenance.

Mr. Williams asked if a minimum size for the road would be required.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the road would have to meet the subdivision control ordinance.

Mr. Williams stated that would give the plan commission more control if it were a minor plat. Mr. Williams explained that the road should not be included in the acreage, it should be back at the building line.

Mr. Woodall stated that it was his understanding that the county was against "flagpole" lots. Mr. Woodall asked if "flagpole" lots would be separate or looked at during the revisions.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that “flagpole” lots cannot be seen from the road, only on a map. Mrs. Zeiner stated that she was not sure what the issue with the “flagpole” lots were or why they are not allowed in the county.

Mr. Scobee stated that when a case comes before the BZA for a hearing, if the neighbors don’t care then why should the county.

Mr. Williams asked what happens when a neighbor complains just because they do not want a house next to their house, would the request be denied.

Mr. Scobee stated that he does not remember anyone being against it.

Mr. Williams asked if this would address the issue of if they only had forty acres but only thirty feet of road frontage, three houses would be allowed.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that would be a minor plat. Mrs. Zeiner explained that nothing over three lots would be allowed.

Mr. Williams asked about doing more than three lots.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that anything over three lots, would not be conserving farm ground.

Mr. Williams asked what about if the ground was just pastured or wooded.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that pasture was still considered farm ground because there are different types of farms. Mrs. Zeiner explained that allowing major subdivisions to agricultural districts could be looked at during the comprehensive plan and zoning updates.

Mr. Underwood asked how the BZA felt about the drafts.

Mr. Scobee stated that there are five members on the BZA, and one member is adamantly opposed to “flagpole” lots, another member is leaning that direction, the others do not seem to care.

Mr. Ensley stated that the BZA is not part of this process, but this board wants input from the BZA which is why there are two members from the BZA on the board. Mr. Ensley explained that the plan commission was the policy setters. Mr. Ensley stated that ordinance changes come before this board before going before the commissioners.

Mr. Scobee stated that he could not speak for the BZA board, but there were at least three members that would like to see the acreage reduced from five acres. Mr. Scobee explained that there was a petition before the BZA recently that wanted to separate a house from a farm. Mr. Scobee stated that the request was for the house and one acre be separated from the farm ground. Mr. Scobee explained that the BZA approved the request to separate the dwelling with two acres, therefore taking an acre out of farm production. Mr. Scobee stated that the BZA does try to stay consistent in the decisions. Mr. Scobee stated that an acre and a half would be more than enough for a dwelling with a primary and secondary septic site.

Mr. Williams stated that the road frontage would have to be at least two hundred feet.

John Zeiner, Attorney, stated that the concern that the BZA was stuck on a precedence that the parcel should be closer to three acres. Mr. Zeiner explained that after the BZA passed it, the board acknowledged that they had the ability to do what was requested. Mr. Zeiner explained that the BZA was allowing the acreage to control the decision not the rules. Mr. Zeiner asked what the county was looking toward as the county grows.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that within the two-mile fringe of the City of Greencastle, the Greencastle ordinances apply to that area, and for an agricultural district the road frontage must be fifty feet. Mrs. Zeiner stated that you could have a property inside the two-mile fringe with fifty feet of road frontage, yet the direct neighbor who is just outside the two-mile fringe must have three hundred fifty feet of road frontage. Mrs. Zeiner stated sometime of compromise would need to be reached.

Mr. Woodall asked what the board needed to do with the proposal.

Mr. Ensley stated that HWC has been hired to update all the ordinances. Mr. Ensley questioned why the more is considering this now. Mr. Ensley stated that the changes are not based on the current comprehensive plan.

Mr. Scobee stated that the other counties are all over the place.

Mr. Ensley stated that based their population and the Comprehensive Plan the zoning ordinance was established. Mr. Ensley explained that the current comprehensive plan is ten years old that is trying to support a zoning ordinance that is thirty years old. Mr. Ensley explained that the proposed ordinance may not meet the current comprehensive plan.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the comprehensive plan is about conserving farm ground. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the argument that has been raised is that the five-acre minimum requirement in an agricultural zoned district does not conserve farm ground.

Mr. Underwood asked what influences the other, if the zoning ordinance is amended does that influence the comprehensive plan or the direction the comprehensive plan will go.

Mr. Ensley stated that the comprehensive plan will be completed with the assistance of the steering committee and focus groups who will steer the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Underwood stated that he could see this ordinance having a positive impact on the comprehensive plan.

Mr. Woodall stated that we are not patching what we currently have. Mr. Woodall explained that the new comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance is a complete overlay and do away with everything that currently exists.

Mr. Ensley stated that consistency and precedence does not matter. Mr. Ensley explained that when there is an estate hearing or whatever, the state statute is layout like ground rules, but every case is different, the BZA should do things a little different then they are. Mr. Ensley stated that there should be consistency, but each case is different. Mr. Ensley stated that if a hardline is taken, then there is no reason for the BZA to exist as the Plan Director can determine if it meets the ordinances. Mr. Ensley explained that the BZA exists for those cases that do not fit into the ordinances. Mr. Ensley explained that the language was changed in some of the ordinances to assist the BZA.

Mr. Underwood stated that he sees this both ways, do we move forward or not. Mr. Underwood explained that the petitions that are coming in we need to do something now. Mr. Underwood stated that even if it is temporary, at least it enables things to move forward now since we are a year and a half plus before the comprehensive plan and zoning ordinances are completed. Mr. Underwood stated that this does not cause irreversible damage.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the Planning and Building Department has issued one hundred ninety-eight (198) permits so far this year. Mrs. Zeiner explained that that is thirty-nine more permits than this time last year.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that most of those permits are in Heritage Lake area, but more and more are out in the country that have to go to the BZA for setbacks, lot size, and/or road frontage.

Mr. Zeiner stated that he was one of those involved in crafting the comprehensive plan, and it was hotly contested about the five acres. Mr. Zeiner explained that he was promised that the BZA had the authority and the only reason for the five acres was so people would come before the BZA so that they would have some sense of what was going on. Mr. Zeiner stated that it was his understanding that the BZA would be very flexible to meet the demands because the five acres was there as an overall to bring people in, the BZA was not described as an absolute. Mr. Zeiner explained that it was an attempt to give the BZA more flexibility. Mr. Zeiner stated that maybe this will not solve the problem.

Mr. Scobee stated that if the acreage and the road frontage was changed, then there may not be a request in front of the BZA. Mr. Scobee explained that there are other items that would still go before the BZA.

Mr. Ensley stated that if you read the strict verbiage of the homestead exemption, the ordinance says, "A homestead variance shall be granted by the County Board of Zoning Appeals if the homestead parcel is the larger of the following: three (3) acres or an acreage estimated by the county Health Department to be large enough for a primary and back up septic system." Mr. Ensley explained that the language of the homestead variance could be changed to say the lesser of two options.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that for the health department would say that the proposal acreage was big enough for two septic sites, is if soil samples are taken to be able to make that determination.

Mr. Scobee stated that is one of the things that comes up during the BZA hearings. Mr. Scobee explained that there could be enough room for a primary and secondary system, but that does mean that the ground would perk, and a system could be installed. Mr. Scobee asked if the buyer or seller would have to pay for the soil sampling and have the system laid out.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the cost of soil sampling varies between soil scientists, it could cost between \$150 to \$250 per boring, or a flat fee.

Mr. Scobee stated that in Hendricks County it is required that a secondary site is laid out and nothing could be built over the area.

Mr. Williams asked if that is part of the plat.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that a plot plan, or an improvement location plan would have to be recorded.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the system would also depend on the size of the dwelling. Mrs. Zeiner explained that soil samples are taken to indicate that the soils will accept a system, but you cannot design a system unless you know how many bedrooms there will be in the dwelling.

Mr. Scobee stated that part of the issue with the BZA is who pays for the soil sampling.

Mr. Underwood asked if the board wanted to continue going forward with the amendments.

Mr. Heeke asked if we were at a point where the comprehensive plan in two (2) years would take care of this or do we have such a problem now that we need to adjust.

Mr. Underwood explained that the reason that he wanted to keep this on the agenda and discuss this is because of the feed back from other board members and having momentum going. Mr. Underwood stated that we don't know when everything is going to take place down the road.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that yes, the comprehensive plan could resolve the issue and yes, there are a lot of cases that would not have to go before the BZA if changes were made now.

Mr. Scobee stated that the company assisting with the comprehensive plan would look at everything that is already in place, and they would come up with an idea.

Mr. Williams stated that the comprehensive plan could be less restrictive than what the current plan is.

Jenna Nees stated that it will be a year, year and a half before the comprehensive plan is done, and then the ordinances would be done after that, so there will be a gap between the two.

Mrs. Zeiner explained that the first six to nine months will be just comprehensive plan meetings, but once the comprehensive plan is more defined the meeting for the zoning ordinance will start. Mrs. Zeiner stated that there would be an overlap of both projects so that they are completed together.

Mr. Ensley stated that when the comprehensive plan is close to the end stages, the zoning ordinance will be started.

Mr. Underwood asked the board how they wanted to proceed.

Mr. Scobee stated he would like to move forward.

Mr. Woodall stated that he was undecided.

Mr. Heeke stated he was undecided.

Mr. Nick Tharp asked how many cases would not go before the BZA with this change.

Mrs. Zeiner stated at least half of the cases that currently are before the BZA would not have to go before the BZA.

Mr. Scobee stated that the biggest thing is preserving farm ground, and that is not currently being done.

Mr. Woodall asked why to go through all the time and effort to change this if we just send things to the BZA like we currently are.

Mr. Underwood stated because it is not working.

Mr. Zeiner stated that the BZA would need to change.

Mr. Woodall asked if the BZA was so overwhelmed that we need to cut down the number of cases.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that if the board votes to move forward, a notice would be placed in the paper, the ordinance changes would come back before the board as a public hearing, and it would go before the commissioners.

Mr. Woodall stated that there wouldn't be an open meeting.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that there would be a public hearing next meeting for anyone, then it would be advertised for the commissioners meeting.

Mrs. Nees stated that this needs to move forward.

Mr. Underwood agreed. Mr. Underwood stated that it is a modification.

Mr. Woodall asked for an explanation of the differences in the current policy and what is proposed.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that for a collector road the setback is currently eighty (80) feet, local road is currently sixty (60) feet for residential structure and fifty (50) feet for agricultural structures, lot size currently is 5 acres, minimum building height did not change, minimum lot width currently is three hundred fifty (350) feet, minimum setbacks for arterial currently is one hundred fifty feet (150), freeway is currently two hundred (200) feet, rear and side setbacks are currently thirty (30) feet. Mrs. Zeiner explained that those numbers apply to both A1 and A2 districts, except the acreage for A2 is three (3) acres.

Mr. Williams asked if there is a freeway, and the setbacks are reduced lot size that is going to take a lot of room.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that I70 is the only freeway in the county.

Mr. Williams asked what 231 was classified as.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that 231, 40, 36 and 236 are classified as either collector or arterial roads per the thoroughfare plan.

Mr. Underwood stated that we need to move forward.

Mr. Scobee stated that the first thing to tackle is the lot size and road frontage. Mr. Scobee explained that another thing that needs to be looked at is allowing a forty (40) or fifty (50) foot road to get back there and then sell up to three lots.

Mr. Underwood stated that if this goes through it will tell us if there really is an issue.

Mr. Heeke asked if the variance request out ways the standards, then there is a problem.

Mr. Underwood asked how many petitioners walk away because they cannot meet the rules.

Mr. Williams stated that he has had clients call him and say that they are going to another county because Putnam County is too restrictive.

Mr. Ensley stated that if anyone is undecided tonight, then the discussion might as well stop. Mr. Ensley explained that all five (5) members would have to vote in favor of moving forward or against moving forward. Mr. Ensley stated that with nine members on the board, the majority of the vote wins, not a majority of who is present, but the majority of the nine members.

Stephanie Campbell stated that basically what the board is doing is speeding the process up because HWC could tweak this with the ordinance changes.

Mr. Underwood stated that if it wasn't a relevant issue, it would not come up as much as it has.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that one of the reasons the plan commission board has been seeing so many conservation subdivisions is because of the actions of the BZA not approving some of the smaller lots.

Mr. Scobee stated that a public hearing would be required for next month.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that she needed to know how to proceed.

Mr. Scobee made a motion to approve proceeding with going forward with the revisions of the agricultural zoning ordinance provisions based on the proposed draft.

Mrs. Nees seconded the motion.

The motion to move forward with all in favor.

Development Plan Review Ordinance: an ordinance to add provisions for review and approval of development plans.

Mrs. Zeiner stated the ordinance was published in the paper back in December when it was first submitted to the board. Mrs. Zeiner explained that during that meeting, it was requested to have fees added to the ordinance. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the fees could change if the county highway engineer reviewed the plans as opposed to hire a third-party engineer.

Mr. Underwood asked if the fees were suggested.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that they were the suggested fees. Mrs. Zeiner explained that since the county does not have an engineer on staff, we would have to hire an engineer to review drainage calculations, and the development plans. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the new highway superintendent is an engineer, so he maybe could review those plans.

Mr. Woodall stated that development plans have nothing to do with the highway, so why would we use him.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that he was an engineer. Mrs. Zeiner explained it was just a thought that could help save money.

Mr. Woodall asked if this ordinance was proposed because the county hired an engineer.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that the ordinance came about because of the proposed RV Park on County Road 1050 South. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the way the current ordinance is written, the RV park could just get a special exception and then be built without review of drainage, design, or development standards.

Mr. Woodall asked why an engineer has not been used in the past.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that there has never been a review process for major subdivisions, commercial site plans, or anything. Mrs. Zeiner explained that RV park, the solar panel project, rummer of new subdivisions all those potential projects as well as the need for a drainage board caused the need for this review process.

Mr. Underwood stated that this is something that Lisa brought up after she became the Plan Director.

Mr. Woodall stated that he would not want to take time from the highway engineer to do these reviews.

Mrs. Zeiner stated she did not have a problem with that it was just a question of whether he could or not.

Mr. Williams stated that the fees would be paid by the petitioner.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was correct.

Mr. Woodall asked if the fees was the only thing that was added.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was correct.

Mr. Woodall asked how the fees came about, what is the average cost for an engineer.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that she had contacted other engineering firms and other counties what they charge for this type of service. Mrs. Zeiner explained that the fees were based on an average, they could be decreased or increased.

Mr. Woodall asked if they would pay two fees, based fee and then engineering fee. Mr. Woodall also asked what a PUD was.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that PUD was a planned unit development, which could be a mix of residential and commercial uses, like Heartland Crossing in Morgan County. Mrs. Zeiner stated that the proposed ordinance could be voted on to be sent to the Commissioners or tabled until the full board is present.

Mr. Underwood asked if the only thing that was missing from the previous draft was the fees.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that was correct.

Mr. Heeke made a motion to approve the Development Plan Review Ordinance as submitted.

Mr. Scobee seconded the motion.

The Development Plan Review Ordinance was approved with all in favor.

Mrs. Zeiner stated that for the Comprehensive Plan, Fillmore does not want to participate. Mrs. Zeiner explained that Cloverdale is on board with the countywide comprehensive plan and zoning ordinance and will pay for their share and will be keeping their BZA and Plan Commission. Mrs. Zeiner stated that Jim Ensley will be attending the Bainbridge Town Council meeting. Mrs. Zeiner explained that they are waiting to hear back from Roachdale and Russellville on their next council meeting date and times.

There being no other business, Mrs. Nees made a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Mr. Heeke seconded the motion.

Meeting adjourned at 7:39 p.m.

Minutes approved on the 8th day of June 2022.

Wendell Underwood
Wendell Underwood, President

**PUTNAM COUNTY ADVISORY PLANNING COMMISSION
AGENDA**

WEDNESDAY MAY 11, 2022

6:30 P.M.

Commissioner's Meeting Room -Putnam County Courthouse
1 W Washington Street - Greencastle, IN 46135
(765) 301-9108

1. CALL TO ORDER

ROLL CALL DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Wendell Underwood Eric Hayman Kevin Scobee Randy Bee Ken Heeke
 Jenna Nees Jay Alcorn Rick Woodall David Penturf Jim Ensley, Attorney Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director

2. REVIEW OF MINUTES – April 13, 2022

- 3. PUBLIC HEARINGS** - Public hearing items have been advertised according to law. For items involving a piece of land, courtesy notices have been sent to some property owners. Testimony for and against each proposal will be taken and a decision by the plan Commission made. The Commission may continue an item to another date for hearing if the public is better served by such a continuance.

❖ **OLD BUSINESS:**

Discussion Only – Agricultural districts of other counties as requested from discussion about changing acre in A1 from 5 acres and the road frontage from 350 feet.

Development Plan Review Ordinance: An ordinance to add provisions for review and approval of development plans review.

❖ **NEW BUSINESS:**

- 4. BUSINESS SESSION** - In its business session, the Plan Commission meets in open session to discuss each item and make a decision. By law, a business session agenda is posted at least 48 hours prior to this meeting. This is not a public hearing. No testimony is taken unless the Plan Commission requests it. The Plan Commission may continue an item to another date for the hearing if the public is better served by such a continuance.

5. OTHER BUSINESS

6. WISHES TO BE HEARD

Information pertaining to these cases is available to the public weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. at the Department of Planning & Building, Putnam County Courthouse 1 W Washington St, 4th Floor Room 46 Greencastle, Indiana 46135. There are times during routine application processing when files may not be immediately available. Written objections to any item on the agenda may be filed with the secretary of the Plan Commission before the hearing. At the hearing, oral comments concerning each Public Hearing proposed will be heard. The jurisdiction of the Plan Commission is all of Putnam County except the City of Greencastle, and the Towns of Bainbridge, Cloverdale, and Roachdale. For more information call (765) 301-9108.

FOR SPECIAL ACCOMODATIONS A NEEDED FOR HANDICAPPED INDIVIDUALS PLANNING TO ATTEND THIS HEARING. PLEASE CALL, THE PLANNING SECRETARY AT (765) 301-9108 AT LEAST 48 HOURS IN ADVANCE OF THE MEETING.

PUTNAM COUNTY PLAN COMMISSION

May 11, 2022

SIGN IN SHEET

PLEASE PRINT CLEARLY

NAME	ADDRESS
Stephanie Campbell	406 Meadow Dr Greencastle IN 46135
Nicholas Tharp	1423 S. 775 E Coatesville 46121
Greg Williams	7 South Sprink St Greencastle
John Zeiner	107 E Washington St GC

PUTNAM COUNTY ORDINANCE 2022-_____

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND THE PUTNAM COUNTY, INDIANA CODE OF ORDINANCES
TITLE XV LAND USAGE CHAPTER 155 ZONING ORDINANCE

WHEREAS The Putnam County Zoning Ordinance now in effect contains an Agriculture Protection District (A1), a Agriculture District (A2), and provisions for a Homestead Variance; and

WHEREAS The Putnam County Plan Commission, at a meeting held on June 8, 2022, did recommend amending the existing ordinance in its entirety as follows:

§ 154.050 DEFINITIONS is hereby amended to remove (2)(b)(6) from the Subdivision Control Ordinance.

§ 155.022 AGRICULTURE PROTECTION DISTRICT (A1) is hereby amended as follows:

(A) *Purpose.* This district is established to protect suitable land for active agricultural production in the county. Agricultural production is recognized as the primary economic activity in the county, and certain lands are particularly suited to such uses because of their size, configuration, sill, topography, and location in relation to other land uses. This district is intended to prevent the conversion of such agricultural lands to urban uses and to promote the compatibility of land uses in the county.

(B) *Permitted Uses.*

- (1) Field crop farm
- (2) Truck crop farm
- (3) Animal husbandry
- (4) Kennels
- (5) Stables
- (6) Forestry
- (7) Veterinary office
- (8) Nursery or greenhouse
- (9) Grazing
- (10) Public utilities (does not apply to wireless facilities)
- (11) Feed stores, excluding the milling or grinding of any feed for commercial purposes
- (12) Confined feeding operations
- (13) Spreading or injecting animal wastes
- (14) Fertilizer storage

(C) *Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures*

- (1) Single-Family Dwelling
- (2) Manufactured Home Type 1 and 2

- (3) Roadside Stand
- (4) Truck Farm Market
- (5) Primary Farm Processing
- (6) Any Use Customarily Accessory to Any Permitted Use
- (7) Grain Storage
- (8) Storage and Management of Animal Wastes
- (9) Barns, Tool Sheds, and Implement Storage Buildings
- (10) Conservation Subdivisions
- (11) Accessory Dwelling
- (12) Minor Subdivision

(D) Development Standards

- (1) The minimum parcel size for all PERMITTED USES in the A1 District shall be five (5) acres.
- (2) The minimum parcel size for all ACCESSORY USES and STRUCTURES shall be two (2) acres, or the minimum acreage estimated by the County Health Department for a primary and backup septic system site, whichever is less. However, in no case shall the parcel size be less than one (1) acre.
- (3) Minimum development standards for the A1 District shall be as shown on the following chart:

STANDARD	Residential Use	Farm/Other Structures	Special Exception*
Front Setbacks			
Collector Road	60 ft	50 ft	60 ft
Local	30 ft	40 ft	30 ft
Lot Size	2 acres	5 acres (minimum)	No limit
Maximum Building Height	35 ft	No limit	35 ft
Minimum Lot Width	200 ft	200 ft	NA
Minimum setbacks for any side of lot abutting			
Arterial	100 ft	100 ft	100 ft
Freeway	200 ft	200 ft	200 ft
Side setbacks	15 ft	15 ft	30 ft
Rear setbacks	15 ft	15 ft	30 ft
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Setback requirements for confined feeding operations are in §155.051 			

- (4) Any portion of a pond or pond dam shall be setback 15 feet from any property line.
- (5) No abandoned, junked, inoperable or derelict vehicles, machinery, farm machinery, equipment or miscellaneous scrap or building debris may be stored in front yards.

(Ord. passed 7/20/1992; Ord. 1994-6-20-2, passed 6/20/1944; Ord. 1999-4-19-1, passed 4/19/1999; Ord. 2001-12-17, passed 12/17/2001; Ord. 2012-9-4, passed 9/4/2012; Ord. 2012-12-3-1, passed 12/3/2012; Ord. 2013-4-1-B, passed 4/1/2013; Ord. 2013-4-13, passed 4/16/2013; Ord. 2013-12-2-B1, passed 12/2/2013)

§155.023 AGRICULTURE DISTRICT (A2) is hereby amended as follows:

(A) *Purpose.* This district is established to permit the full range of agricultural activities as well as certain planned large lot residential development with development standards, which protect the full range of agricultural uses as determined by the Plan Commission, and other uses customarily conducted in agricultural areas. This use is primarily located along highways and scenic corridors, and adjacent to municipalities.

(B) *Permitted Uses:*

- (1) Uses permitted in A1 Agricultural Protection District, EXCEPT confined Feeding Operations, Kennels, and Manufactured Home Type 2
- (2) Farm and Farm Buildings
- (3) Public Parks
- (4) Feed Stores, including the milling or grinding of any feed for commercial purposes

(C) *Permitted Accessory Uses and Structures:*

- (1) Single-Family Dwellings
- (2) Roadside Stand
- (3) Accessory Buildings as related to Agriculture or Single-Family Residential Use
- (4) Home Occupation
- (5) Conservation Subdivision
- (6) Accessory Dwelling
- (7) Minor Subdivision

(D) *Development Standards:*

- (1) The minimum parcel size for PERMITTED USES in the A2 District shall be three (3) acres.
- (2) The minimum parcel size for PERMITTED ACCESSORY USES and STRUCTURES one (1) acre, or the minimum acreage estimated by the County Health Department for a primary and backup septic system site, provided that the proposed parcel size is not less than one (1) acre.
- (3) Minimum lot frontage on road and lot width at building line shall be 200 feet.
- (4) Any portion of a pond or pond dam shall be set back 15 feet from property line.
- (5) Minimum development standards for the A2 District shall be as shown on the following chart

STANDARD	Residential Use	Farm/Other Structures	Special Exception*
Front Setbacks			
Collector Road	60 ft	50 ft	60 ft
Local	30 ft	40 ft	30 ft
Lot Size	1 acre	3 acres (minimum)	No limit
Maximum Building Height	35 ft	No limit	35 ft
Minimum Lot Width	200 ft	200 ft	NA

Minimum setbacks for any side of lot abutting			
Arterial	100 ft	100 ft	100 ft
Freeway	200 ft	200 ft	200 ft
Side setbacks	15 ft	15 ft	30 ft
Rear setbacks	15 ft	15 ft	30 ft
• Setback requirements for confined feeding operations are in §155.051			

(6) No abandoned, junked, inoperable or derelict vehicles, machinery, farm machinery, equipment or miscellaneous scrap or building debris may be stored in front yards.

(Ord. passed 7/20/1992; Ord. 1999-4-19-1, passed 4/19/1999; Ord. 2012-9-4, passed 9/4/2021; Ord. 2012-12-3-2, passed 12/3/2012)

DULY ADOPTED this _____ day of _____, 2022.

Putnam County Board of Commissioners

Rick Woodall

Tom Helmer

Dave Berry

ATTEST BY: _____
Kristina Berish, Auditor

Prepared by Lisa Zeiner, Plan Director, 1 W Washington St Greencastle, IN 46135